

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

KIERON DEREK PENIGAR,	§	
Petitioner,	§	
	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:06-CV-759-Y
	§	
NATHANIEL QUARTERMAN, Director,	§	
Texas Department of Criminal Justice,	§	
Correctional Institutions Division,	§	
Respondent.	§	

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
AND NOTICE AND ORDER

This cause of action was referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), as implemented by an order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas. The Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge are as follows:

I. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. NATURE OF THE CASE

This is a petition for writ of habeas corpus by a state prisoner under 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

B. PARTIES

Petitioner Kieron Derek Penigar, TDCJ-ID # 721657, is in custody of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, and is incarcerated in Lamesa, Texas.

Respondent Nathaniel Quartermann is the Director of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division.

C. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The history relevant to this case is set forth in the undersigned's findings and conclusions

in *Penigar v. Dretke*, Civil Action No. 4:04-CV-092-A.¹ This action was transferred to this court from the Tyler Division by order dated October 15, 2006. This is at least the second federal petition for writ of habeas corpus filed by Williams challenging his 1995 state conviction and/or sentence for aggravated sexual assault of a child in cause number 0536768D in the Criminal District Court Number Four of Tarrant County, Texas. His previous petition was dismissed as time-barred on May 11, 2004. *Id.* This petition was received by the clerk of court for filing on October 30, 2006.

D. SUCCESSIVE PETITION

28 U.S.C. § 2244(b) requires dismissal of a second or successive petition filed by a state prisoner under § 2254 unless specified conditions are met. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1)-(2). The fact that an earlier petition was dismissed with prejudice on limitations grounds does not remove the subsequent petition from the second-successive requirements of § 2244(b). *See Hooker v. Sivley*, 187 F.3d 680, 682 (5th Cir. 1999); *Anders v. Cockrell*, No. 03:02-CV-2513-N, 2003 WL 102615, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 8, 2003) (not designated for publication); *Somerville v. Cockrell*, No. 3:02-CV-0380-L, 2002 WL 31441226, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Oct. 29, 2002) (not designated for publication). Thus, before such a petition is filed in federal district court, the petitioner must move in the appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application. *Id.* § 2244(b)(3).

From court records of which this court can take judicial notice, it is apparent that this is a successive petition filed without authorization from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1)-(3). This court is, therefore, without jurisdiction to consider the petition. *Id.*;

¹The court takes judicial notice of the federal and state court records, which it is entitled to do, relevant to this action as well as Williams's previous federal petition.

Hooker, 187 F.3d at 681-82.

II. RECOMMENDATION

Quarterman's motion to dismiss Penigar's petition should be GRANTED and the petition dismissed without prejudice to Penigar's right to file a motion for leave to file a successive petition in the United States District Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit under 28 U.S.C. §2244(b)(3)(A).²

III. NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT TO PROPOSED FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION AND CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO OBJECT

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), each party to this action has the right to serve and file specific written objections in the United States District Court to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation within ten (10) days after the party has been served with a copy of this document. The court is extending the deadline within which to file specific written objections to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation until January 5, 2006. The United States District Judge need only make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation to which specific objection is timely made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(B)(1). Failure to file by the date stated above a specific written objection to a proposed factual finding or legal conclusion will bar a party, except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice, from attacking on appeal any such proposed factual finding or legal conclusion accepted by the United States District Judge. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc op. on reh'g); *Carter v. Collins*, 918 F.2d 1198, 1203 (5th Cir. 1990).

²Because the court lacks jurisdiction in this action, no recommendation is made as to Quarterman's motion for rule 11 sanctions.

IV. ORDER

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636, it is ORDERED that each party is granted until January 5, 2006, to serve and file written objections to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation. It is further ORDERED that if objections are filed and the opposing party chooses to file a response, a response shall be filed within seven (7) days of the filing date of the objections.

It is further ORDERED that the above-styled and numbered action, previously referred to the United States Magistrate Judge for findings, conclusions, and recommendation, be and hereby is returned to the docket of the United States District Judge.

SIGNED December 15, 2006.

/s/ Charles Bleil
CHARLES BLEIL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE